### 5.14 Hazardous Materials Assessment

### 5.14.1 Environmental Setting

A Phase 1 environmental site assessment was conducted in July 1996 for the proposed project. All 100 acres of the project were investigated, and a record search was conducted. This study is preliminary and will be supplemented prior to the onset of construction activities. This is a customary treatment of these types of studies.

In addition, the County of Orange, EMA, Environmental Resources Section, completed a review and environmental investigation of two irrigation ponds located within the Musick Jail. The findings of the investigation determined that the manmade ponds were historically used solely as irrigation settling ponds and were not associated with any sewage treatment processes. No hazardous materials contamination issues were identified.

Finally, investigations of the Department of the Navy on the MCAS El Toro have identified an old landfill area to the northwest of the Musick site. This landfill area is scheduled for remediation beginning in 1997. The disposal area has contaminated (through groundwater movement) a very small area of the Musick jail facility at the extreme northwesterly corner. This contamination area on the Musick Jail site is within the right-of-way for future Alton Parkway. Alton Parkway cannot be extended northeasterly of the Musick site until such time as the Department of the Navy completes this remediation activity. The area of contamination on the Musick Jail site is northeast of the access planned off Alton Parkway, and therefore will not interfere in any way with the construction of the facility.

#### 5.14.2 Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation

The Phase 1 environmental assessment performed for the site identified no medium or major environmental concerns and only two minor environmental concerns. Further, it identified two potential environmental conditions. One of these conditions involved several pad-mounted transformers that were observed on the site. Some transformers installed prior to 1978 were filled with a fluid containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), an acutely hazardous material. Although no leakage or staining was apparent on or around the transformers, and Southern California Edison maintains some of the transformers on the property, further sampling should be performed prior to the movement of these transformers to determine if there are any further issues.

The second environmental condition involves the previously discussed disposal site. As noted above, the disposal site will be remediated beginning in 1997.

Finally, one of the minor environmental concerns dealt with the potential for the soil to harbor significant amounts of agricultural chemicals, such as pesticides. Testing for the presence of these pesticides will occur prior to the construction of Complex 1 and

Complex 3, where the concern for the agricultural contamination was identified. However, there is very little potential for agricultural chemicals to have been applied in such a concentration that they would pose environmental risk. Even if this were the case, the type of remediation that is called for in those instances is simple to perform and does not pose any further risk.

The second minor environmental concern dealt with the possibility of the presence of asbestos in some of the older buildings. This is an issue when these buildings are demolished. It is not unusual for buildings of this period, and there are standard abatement techniques adopted for demolition.

Other minor environmental concerns in this second category involved various minor on-site conditions, such as an underground storage tank, six 55-gallon drums, a small oil pump which may have leaked, and the storage and usage of some solvents on-site. The technical subconsultant does not raise significant concerns in these areas, but rather calls for confirmation of these conditions following project approval but prior to project construction. This is the normal course of action, and is often of assistance in precise design, where the input of the technical consultant in this regard can save valuable time and money.

There are no sites on the lists compiled pursuant to §65962.5 of the Government Code for hazardous materials within one mile of the site, nor is the site on any such list.

Therefore, it is concluded that there are no hazardous materials issues with respect to this site.

Although pesticides and fertilizers are routinely kept on-site to assist in agricultural operations, they are stored in the workshop buildings. The storage of pesticides is also highly regulated.

# 5.14.3 Mitigation Measures

52. Prior to the construction of any buildings on the Musick site, a further environmental site assessment shall be conducted to confirm the absence of agricultural chemicals in significant amounts, the absence of asbestos in buildings, and the absence of any environmental risks from the transformers.

## 5.14.4 <u>Level of Significance After Mitigation</u>

Following mitigation, no significant environmental impacts will remain as a result of this project. If any of the environmental issues are determined present, their abatement is a matter of such stringent regulation that all risks to public health are eliminated.